

*Other agenda item*

7 September 1983

**MEMORANDUM FOR:**

[redacted]  
Director, Planning and Policy Staff  
Intelligence Community Staff

STAT

**FROM:**

[redacted]  
Chief, Intelligence Producers Council Staff

STAT

**SUBJECT:**

Imagery Requirements Forecast—30 August SAG Meeting

ILLEGIB

[redacted]  
1. The work being done by [redacted] and his group will lead to a useful product only if the judgments provided are believable to those who will make decisions based on the material. This may seem to be a self-evident statement, but it needs nevertheless to be at the front of our minds as we review the progress of this study.

STAT

2. Over the years the Community has in various ways tried to do two things: project future Intelligence needs, and assess the contribution—relative or absolute—of collection sources. In terms of providing a product which is actually used for planning and resource decisions, we have not been successful in either of these endeavors. Since our meeting last week I have mulled over the history of these types of activities, trying to recognize why we have not been successful. Several reasons come to mind: the judgments were essentially subjective, lacking an evidential basis of any substance; the conclusions were inconsistent with preconceptions; the judgments were formed into a rigid structure which, if used for programming resources over an extended period could reduce our ability to react to the changing environment.

ILLEGIB

3. There is no question but that the contractor personnel have impressive credentials for doing this work. But as time goes by their experience in the intelligence field will carry less and less weight, and so the study results must to a large measure stand by themselves and not just be the expression of judgment of a small number of very smart people. There must somehow be a solid base of evidence to support the work. The greatest service the contractor could provide might well be the definition of this body of evidence. With regard to the work of identifying future needs and assessing collection contributions, I tend to agree with the statement [redacted] made early in his briefing—that this work is better done within the Community. As you know, the NIC is already addressing future intelligence problems for your staff. I have to wonder why a contractor should be asked to do the same thing. Perhaps you and I, Charlie Waterman, and a few others should discuss this matter.

STAT

STAT  
ILLEGIB

STAT

STAT

(3)

**Page Denied**